(1891-92)

	: Japanese : : 2010-03-09 (Ja): (En): : , : :
URL	http://hdl.handle.net/10291/7770

Meiji University Graduate School
Bulletin Vol. 26, 1989.2

Parvus's Theory of Hunger (1891-1892)

1. The Undercurrent of "Workers' Democracy"

PARVUS UND DIE HUNGERSNOT IN RUBLAND: 1891-1892 -EIN BEITRAG ZUR ANALYSE DER GRUNDLAGE SEINER "ARBEITERDEMOKRATIE" 1

Doctoral Program, Department of Political Science, entered in 1961
Shinichi Nishikawa
Nishikawa Shinichi

First

The great famine that struck European Russia from 1891 to 1892 was said to be the worst in modern Russian history. The number of people in the region who were on the brink of starvation reached as many as 30 to 40 million. It goes without saying that the authorities in the country were deeply shocked by this. The Great Famine was a turning point for the Russian revolutionary movement at the time. In the reactionary times of the 19th century, veteran politicians such as Mikhailovsky believed that "small acts of kindness" were more important than revolutionary actions. In the face of the plight of hunger, the intelligentsia regained its former social interest, while those born in the 1970s This incident led many young intellectuals in the country to embrace Marxism.1) One of them was Marxist According to Lutov, "The Great All-Russian Famine of 1891-92 brought about a transformation in the Social Democratic movement, From then on, the social democratic movement developed rapidly. 2) The energy of the revolutionary forces, which had been revived by the Great Famine, It eventually culminated in the Revolution of 1905.

During this revolution, the German Social Democrats drew attention by presenting a vision of the Russian Revolution known as "Workers' Democracy." When discussing the SPD member Parvus (real name Helfant, 1867-1924)3), The famine cannot be ignored. In the 1990s, he made his name as a left-wing commentator in the SPD forum. His achievements began with his analysis of the Great Famine. At that time, he had just studied in Switzerland and joined the SPD in Stuttgart. However, his analysis of the famine contained the germinal points that would later bear fruit in his "Theory of Workers' Democracy," and the foundations for his revolution This attitude is observed4).

I have previously mentioned the "theory of workers' democracy."5) I will not go into detail again, but the gist of it is

He defined the Russian Revolution as a proletarian-led bourgeois revolution and called on the proletariat of Western Europe to provide its support. Furthermore, as the Western European revolution supported the Russian revolution, socialism also began to take hold in Russia. In a sense, this was the precursor to Trotsky's "theory of permanent revolution" And Russian Marxists, inspired by Parvus's argument, While observing the rapid progress of the Soviet Union, he began to develop the "Debate on Permanent Revolution" (Takahashi Kaoru). This meant a reexamination of his theory of "discontinuous two-stage revolution." It can be said that the role of

The purpose of this paper is to analyze the current situation in Russia, which Parvus wrote in his mid-20s in the wake of the Great Famine. The purpose of this book is to explore the underlying currents of this "theory of workers' democracy" by using these essays. It is only by clarifying Luvs's perception of Russia that we can gain a more three-dimensional picture of his theory of the Russian Revolution. Perhaps not.

1. The causes of the Great Famine

How big was the Great Russian Famine? According to statistics, The total harvest of the 16 hardest hit provinces was 139 million chetverts in 1890 (1 chetvert = 209.21 liters), but by 1991 it had dropped sharply to just under 7.8 million. Looking at all 50 prefectures, yields are at their lowest in the past 10 years, with the decline in rye, the staple food of farmers, being particularly noticeable. e).[6]

The direct cause of this severe crop failure was the bad weather that continued from the fall of 1890 to the summer of 1891, but the fundamental cause was The main reason for this is the deterioration of farm management, which can be said to be an inevitable consequence of the emancipation of serfs. Due to the Emancipation Edict of 1811, many peasants had their arable land cut off by the feudal lords, and In order to acquire ownership of the allotted land, a large amount of money had to be paid for the repurchase. The land was transferred to the rural community in bulk, and the community was held jointly responsible for the payment of the redemption money, etc. These factors meant that farmers were barely able to make ends meet. The grain export encouragement policy of Vyshnegradsky (Witte's predecessor) exacerbated the poverty of the peasants. In order to stabilize the economy and establish the gold standard, he forced the starvation export of grain at the expense of the peasants. Grain was Russia's main export item. His ideas are clearly expressed in the following passage:[7]

In response to the above situation, so-called critical intellectuals in Russia launched a debate on the famine. The main point of contention was the exhaustion of peasant farming, which was the cause of the famine. The Narodniks saw this as a case of capitalism at the expense of agriculture. While Marxists saw it as the result of the slow capitalisation of agriculture. [8]

The background to the young Parvus's publication of articles on the Great Famine in the SPD's official journal was as follows: He later recalled: "In 1892 I wrote a series of essays on famine.

In it I predicted the rapid development of industry and the revolutionary movement in Russia."9) Here the keynote of his theory of hunger is In particular, his four-part series "The State of Russia," published in the Vorwarts in June 1992, is his most representative analysis of the famine. This paper, written at the tender age of 24, has attracted the attention of readers for its "incredibly deep knowledge" 10) At the beginning of the book, Parvus describes the view that Russia's severe harvest famine was caused by bad weather as "a commonplace, He dismissed this view as "particularly that of Western observers" and pointed out the ultimate transformation of the Russian agricultural structure that lay behind it. He argues that clarity is what is needed. And 1D has set the task of "the State of Russia" in the investigation of this. How did he understand the causes of the famine?

Parvus begins by examining the harvest forecast for that year (1992). He believes that the poor harvest of the previous year will affect the crop situation of that year. The most noticeable effect is the extreme shortage of grain for sowing. The same applies to winter grains and spring grains. In the case of winter grains, due to bad weather in the autumn of the previous year, the harvest was abandoned on cultivated land In addition, the current situation is that only half of the cultivated land is sown with spring grains. The sharp decline in draft animals, which are a source of energy and manure, has dealt a serious blow to farmers. (In Russia at that time, a farmer without a working horse meant losing his farm business12) The remaining working horses are nothing more than living corpses. This will inevitably lead to a shortage of fertilizer and a stagnation of agricultural work. The peasants are so exhausted that it seems as if "half of Russia has turned into a sickbed." Therefore, Parvus concludes, "This year's harvest will be successful even if the weather conditions are favorable. Even if it is a harvest of some kind, it is certain to be much worse than the previous year's harvest."13

Based on these considerations, Parvus emphasizes that the famine was not a coincidence, but rather that the He points out that it is the inevitable product of accumulated evils. The narrowness of the land allotted to them, heavy taxes, the old-fashioned cultivation method (three-field system), and the fragmentation of farmland were pointed out as "soil for famine." 14) In other words, the liberated peasants were forced to live on small plots of land and a low-productivity three-field system, with no repayment of the repurchase money, They were forced to pay poll taxes, etc. In fact, because of this, farmers at that time were always on the brink of starvation. They were on the brink of disaster, and the only way they could get out of this dire situation was to increase grain production. However, there has been little improvement in agricultural technology, and the solution has been to expand cultivated land. The land, pastures, and forests were converted into arable land (the peasants' land allocation included not only arable land but also house plots, pastures, and in some cases This sometimes included forests, and the practice of plundering was practiced. Moreover, the fall in grain prices due to the international agricultural crisis in the 1980s encouraged farmers to increase grain production. This accelerated the trend.16)

Parvus saw the negative side of these peasant efforts: what he saw as recklessness in the forest areas. The rapid conversion of land into farmland has uprooted millions of hectares of forest and destroyed the natural environment. Heat waves and dust storms are hitting crops, rivers are drying up, and land is becoming increasingly barren. However, "the breadbasket of Europe and the most fertile region of the world" is turning into "a barren and miserable wasteland." Russia is also at a disadvantage in the international grain market, sandwiched between the United States and the East Indies. In the end, farmers are forced to compensate for falling grain prices by increasing the amount of grain produced, which further encourages the expansion of cultivated land.

As a result, fallow land became increasingly narrow, and the land was wasted without being able to fully develop its fertility. The collapse occurred because of this."17) Parvus said that the Russian peasantry was caught in a vicious cycle even worse than the one in which it had been trapped since the emancipation of the serfs. This was seen as the fundamental cause of the great famine.

By the way, Parvus, at this point, had not yet mentioned the effect that the famine export of grain had had on the impoverishment of the peasants. Many of his Russian contemporaries criticized the "Vishnegradsky regime" after the Great Famine. However, it is a simplistic view to attribute the responsibility for the famine to Vishnegradsky's policies and the serfdom. Some studies have suggested that the long-term consequences of the export of hunger are the main cause of poverty in rural Russia.18) He will discuss the shield after inspecting the actual situation of the famine that struck Russia again in 1897-98. He described the reality of "Starving Russia" as "The chronic hunger of Russian peasants is the counterpart of Russia's grain exports." They concluded that "19).

In any case, the famine was a condensed expression of the contradictions inherent in modern Russian society. How did he predict the future of Russian society as hunger became chronic?

2. Famine and Russian Society

(1) The decomposition of the peasant class

The greatest victims of the Great Famine were, of course, the peasants who made up the overwhelming majority of the population. To predict the future of society, one must first understand the current situation of the peasant class. After pointing out the terrible conditions caused by the tax, he goes on to discuss Tsarism.

He argues that the harshness of the taxes is easily understood from the fact that there are always unpaid taxes. Even if the harvest is good, it will be offset by this arrears. In fact, the quality of the harvest was of no concern to them. Also, in order to pay taxes, they had to sell grain at a bargain price in the fall. The practice of "autumn prostitution" is also common, where the crops are bought back at double the price in the spring for sowing. The Russian tax system is structured so that farmers who own less arable land pay a higher tax burden. If we classify the land area into five levels, the highest group is 1 Dishatina (1.09292 hectares). The tax rate for the lowest group was 99 kopecks, while that for the lowest group was 6 rubles 82 kopecks. The calculation will increase20).

Indeed, Parvus's observations above can be said to have accurately captured the contradictions typical of rural Russia. For example, taxes are collected in the fall, forcing farmers to provide grain at a seasonally low price, and the spring lean season. In some areas, as much as 80% of the farmers were forced to buy grain. In particular, middle-class and poor farmers were forced to take on debt to purchase grain, resulting in a state of debt slavery." Many people fell into this trap. 21) Also, "The smaller the land allocation they received, the greater the amount of tribute they received. The so-called "decreasing tax system" (increasing tax rates in proportion to the number of serfs) is considered a highly unusual feature of the emancipation of the serfs. 22)

The result of such harsh taxation on the peasants appeared to Parvus as follows:

Under these conditions, the small peasant would inevitably decline, and his land and beasts of burden would fall into the hands of the wealthy peasants and moneylenders. ... What will happen? The collapse of peasant Russia will occur. This is already evident from the facts. It is clear that the profits are distributed as evenly as possible among individual farmers. The land owned by the rural community, which was then allocated to the peasant farming community, was the basic principle of Russian agriculture until now. The state of affairs has now collapsed. The rural community has been dissolved." The farmers who were in debt were forced to lease land, abandon the allocated land, and the land was concentrated in the hands of wealthy farmers, which turned rural communities into a mere negligence 23) He argued that the structural contradictions in Russian agriculture, which manifested themselves in the most acute form of the Great Famine, He concluded that the disintegration of the peasant class would lead to the disintegration of rural communities.

Parvus's theory of the disintegration of the community presented here attributes the cause of disintegration to external pressure, namely, the "heavy burden of taxes." In other words, this logic alone cannot provide a solution to the external pressure. If the pressure is removed, there is no danger that the Narodnik view that the community can be restored will be in line with the current view. For example, Flerovsky, author of "The Condition of the Working Class in Russia" (1869), If the rural community is considered the best form of agriculture and external obstacles such as the payment of redemption fees are removed, He believed that agricultural productivity would increase rapidly and that the economic advantages of rural communities would become clear. 25) So Parvus The following words of the author could also serve as a rebuttal to the Narodniks' defense of communities: "The liberation policies of the 1960s Russia has become a commodity-producing country, and the transition from simple commodity production to complex capitalist production is taking place. 26

To add to the explanation, Parvus said that in Russia, the Emancipation Edict of 1861 marked the beginning of the The foundation of the real economy has been replaced by a commodity economy, and now we are moving towards a capitalist economy, so the community They recognized that a return to the commodity economy was impossible, since it was based on the common ownership of land. It is incompatible with the communitarian principle. Therefore, the Narodnik view mentioned above loses its basis for argument. And once they entered capitalism, the peasant class, the direct producers, became bourgeois. The idea of dividing the world into two poles, the aggressor and the proletariat, was popular among European Marxists at the time. This was a common understanding, and it was no exception even in the underdeveloped country of Russia. Parvus also took this premise. Therefore, he emphasized the fact that the Great Famine would rapidly accelerate the inevitable decline of peasant communities and the disintegration of their communities. There it was.

So how can we solve the chronic financial difficulties facing farmers? Parvus says In order to free the poor from the poverty of the poor, the social conditions of agriculture must be changed. From the logical structure above, the way forward was obvious.

(2) Insights into the development of capitalism

As mentioned before, Parvus was in Germany and in the early 1990s Russia was transitioning from a commodity economy to a capitalist economy. The revival of Russian agriculture was also considered from this perspective. In other words, it was the capitalization of Russian agriculture. He believed that increasing agricultural productivity required capital. Specifically, he said that the three-field system should be changed to a crop rotation system and that manure should be used for farming.

Instead, they proposed applying alternative fertilizers, improving irrigation, and replacing draft animals with agricultural machinery. "That requires capital." This makes it increasingly difficult for farmers to compete with large landowners. "Therefore it is certain that before long the last link of peasant status will be wiped out."28)」28)

In other words, in Parvus's view, the decline of the peasantry, the progress of which is accelerated by the famine. This was further accelerated by efforts to improve productivity in order to overcome the The abandonment of land and proletarianization were deemed inevitable. The only options left for the impoverished peasants were to turn to landlords, the wealthy. They could either become land proletariat by selling their labor to the agricultural sector, or they could move to the cities and become urban proletariat. In any case, they will become cheap labor. Wuss states: "The peasants' land became the property of the capitalists, and the peasants themselves became wage laborers for the capitalists. The small-scale farming will be replaced by large-scale capitalist farming."29) He then pointed out the disintegration of the peasant class and the We find a close connection between this and the development of capitalism in Russia.

What was attracting attention at the time was the cheap labor force that would be created by the decline of small farmers. In recent years, Russian industry has been under the protection of protective tariffs (July 1, 1891 marked the final tariff increase since 1977). Then, after the new high protective tariffs were imposed, China experienced growth and is now on a par with Western Europe. Russia has abundant mineral resources, and its vast territory has allowed it to function as a contiguous colony and a commodity exporter. On the other hand, the main obstacle to industrial development is the labor shortage. "Taking these things into consideration, it is difficult to see how the proletarianization of the peasant masses will affect Russian industry. It will become increasingly clear whether this will gain significant momentum."31」31)

Thus, Parvus recognized the role of cheap labor as a lever for the development of Russian industry. It is not surprising that they are so confident that Russia will become a capitalist "prosperous" country within the next 15 years. "Great industrial cities with hundreds of thousands of people, refineries in mining regions, coal mines, and railroads that crisscross the country. The network, the vast distribution of goods both domestically and in Asia, the land perfect for cultivation, cultivation and sowing, the Grain exports, huge wealth, low interest rates, the masses of urban wage laborers and rural wage laborers The masses – this is probably what Russia will be like in 15 years."32) In other words, he was saying that the development of capitalism It was anticipated that comprehensive agriculture and industry would be realized in the near future.

Judging from the above arguments, Parvus put forward an extremely optimistic theory of capitalist development. He is a man of one country, and he is assuming the sequence of the physical economy → commodity economy → capitalist economy, and he is The inevitable disintegration of rural communities and the rapid disintegration caused by the Great Famine, was the internal impetus for the development of Russian capitalism. It is true that Russian capitalism made remarkable progress after 1890. In that sense, he was keenly aware of the trends of the times. This is in contrast to Plekhanov's prediction in the 1960s that Russia would follow a "long and difficult capitalist path." The 1980s was a time of "slow development." The Narodniks were the ones who advocated the "decline of Russian capitalism." However, in the 1990s, there was no longer any room for this, and the Russian Marx ideologists have advocated various theories of capitalist development.

If we consider Parvus's argument in this context, it is based on the same perspective as Lenin's "market theory." As is well known, Lenin wrote in his first essay, "New Economic Trends in Peasant Life" (1893) From his early works on agricultural theory to his magnum opus The Development of Capitalism in Russia (1899) In this paper, he argued for the polarisation of the peasantry and the resulting formation of a capitalist domestic market, and from this He advocated the spontaneous internal development of capitalism.34) Indeed, Parvus was not as precise as Lenin. Although he does not develop a theory, the starting point of his argument can be considered to be roughly the same. had similar limitations

In other words, Parvus also ignored the peculiarities of the development of capitalism in Russia, a backward country. Unlike the case of the earlier capitalist country Britain, the capitalism of the United States did not cause a clear polarization of the peasantry. This is because the industries of the late capitalist countries, including Russia, were not advanced. The transplantation of technological systems has forced the development of high capital organic structures, and the demand for labor is low. Therefore, the labor force that industry can draw from rural areas to cities will be weak. They had to stay in the village and earn a living there. This was the origin of the harsh labor system.35) However, Despite his deep awareness of the exploitation of the peasants, he did not readily accept the view that the peasant class would inevitably disintegrate. Rather, the rapid disintegration caused by famine was viewed from the perspective of revolutionary strategy, namely, the expansion of the revolutionary proletariat. The theoretical origin of this theory is Engels's The Peasant Question in France and Germany. 36) However, Parvus's negative assessment of the peasants was based on the revolutionary actions of the peasants in the 1905 Revolution. In the face of vital energy, correction is inevitable.37)

(3) Theory of Tsarism

Now for Parvus, who had derived a vision of Russia's future as a capitalist development from the decline of the peasantry, The question was whether it was compatible with the Tsarist regime. The discussion then moves on to a political analysis. First, the financial situation of the Tsarist regime is examined.

Before we begin discussing Parvus, let us first consider the fact that Russia's revenue at the time was said to be a "tax system of mass plunder." I will briefly touch on the structure of the tax system. It was a structure that was heavily weighted towards indirect taxes. In 1892, direct taxes accounted for only 9.4% of expenditures, while indirect taxes accounted for a whopping 49.0%. Moreover, alcohol taxes accounted for 27.7% of the total. Furthermore, the farmers' "buyback" payments were 7.9%.38) (The regulations of the Emancipation Edict This allowed farmers to buy back the land they had been allocated with payments from the state, and to cut off their relationship with landlords in one fell swoop. However, this made the farmers debtors of the state, and they had to pay the amount of the advance payments to the government for 49 years. 39) As a result, the peasants were the main players in the Tsarist finances. With these points in mind, let us return to Parvus's theory.

Furthermore, the decline of the peasantry, who were the main source of tax revenue for the Tsarist regime, directly meant financial difficulties. This is evident from the fact that farmers are accumulating unpaid taxes due to heavy taxes and poor harvests.

However, what was even more damaging to the system was the sharp decline in alcohol tax revenue. The peasants, who were also major consumers, were impoverished by the famine and as a result, "liquor taxes were bound to bring in very little revenue." 40) Parvus saw that the peasants' tax-paying capacity had already been exhausted.

However, it is also true that "expenditures" such as interest payments on national bonds and military maintenance costs cannot be reduced. As Parvus points out, in the same year, 1992, the proportion of these two items in total expenditures was 1.2% of the total current expenditure. 41) Thus, fiscal reconstruction became the biggest concern. Loans are merely a stopgap measure. After all, "the government relies on the economically powerful class of society." In other words, Tsarism, which had relied on the peasantry until now, was increasingly expanding its economic power. The policy of the Tsarist government would therefore be to "It has to correspond to the goals of capital." The interests of capital take precedence over everything else, and absolutism The only way out for Tsarism is for the people to become slaves of capitalism. 42) This is the This answer was derived from an examination of the prefecture's financial situation.

Parvus also analyzes the standing army and the absolutist bureaucracy, the two pillars that support the absolutist regime. He observed that in Russia, both sides were completely relaxed. Even in the army, which is known for its strict standards, dissatisfaction with treatment, food, etc. was already building up, and junior officers in particular were threatening to revolt. The loyalty of the soldiers is also wavering. Therefore, in the event of an uprising, the government It would be difficult for them to send troops to the area. 43) The same is true for the civil service The issue was whether salaries would be paid on time. Therefore, "if the civil servant class begins to become revolutionary, This is proof that they have the nose of a hound that they can no longer expect to receive a regular salary. The corpse of Russian absolutism is already giving off such a foul stench that it is noticeable even to the official class." 44)

In light of the situation of dependence on capital, alienation of the military and bureaucracy, and, as already mentioned, the potential for discontent among the peasants, who are being taxed more than their harvest, Parvus asserts that "absolutism is no longer "The lifeblood of the Russian Empire is running out. Russia will have a constitution." He predicted the transition from imperialism to a constitutional system. However, the problem lay in its substance. Parvus was concerned with the Russian bourgeoisie, who were to be the bearers of the constitutional system. He points out the limitations of the Aziz government. They would not want a democratic constitution (i.e., a democratic system). They want to realize the fundamental principles of a democratic constitution, such as universal suffrage, freedom of the press, speech, and assembly. This is not possible, because if this were to happen, political power would fall into the hands of the masses of the people. The freedom that Azh needs exists in the Russian Empire. It is not possible to print price lists or advertising pamphlets. The freedom to spread the word, to form corporations, and to hold shareholders' meetings and debate freely."45

Thus, Parvus had already sensed the political reactionary nature of the Russian bourgeoisie at this point. So what kind of force will bring about a democratic constitution and true freedom?

3. Searching for a new image of revolution

(1) Proletarian Hegemony

Indeed, the attainment of a democratic constitution and political freedom was a common goal of the Russian revolutionary movement at that time. In the late 1980s, the terrorism of the People's Will Party subsided, while Russian Marxism rose. As the country entered the new era, the immediate task of "establishing political freedom" became a focus of attention as a point of contact for uniting revolutionary factions. At the time, many people were aiming for a joint struggle between revolutionaries and liberals to realize this vision. Pre-Nobu was still distrustful of Peral in 1990, but by 1992, he was facing the famine of liberals. He was sympathetic to the relief efforts and began to call on them to unite with the socialists. 46) Founded in Saratov in the summer of 1893 The People's Rights Party, which was founded in 1999, is a prime example of this movement. He advocated the unity of socialists and the progressive forces of the bourgeoisie.47)

Considering the above-mentioned developments in Russia, Parvus's assertion on this point is quite distinctive. In other words, he asserts that only the working class is serious about democratic constitutions and freedoms. "This class must gain freedom in order to be able to organize itself and to oppose the power of capital. And this class must acquire a democratic constitution, for only in this way can they have political power. According to Parvus, the monarchy was weakened by the decline of the peasantry, which was its economic base. This would be a concession to the capitalist class that holds the economic power of the country. The constitution is "given" to the capitalist class. However, soon The working class, dissatisfied with this, rose up to democratize the constitution. They will not be able to withstand the bitter struggle against the dictatorship of the United States. But the victory will surely be theirs! 」48)

What is the basis for Parvus's confidence? However, can we really expect such growth from Russia's still tiny working class? Of course, he was aware of the dire situation of workers in Russia at the time. For example, there were many migrant workers from rural areas The actual situation of low-wage labor among coal miners, who account for half of the total, is shown separately49), and the poor conditions of workers engaged in the construction of the Trans-Siberian Railway are also shown. He denounced the unfavorable working conditions and the unlimited exploitation of the Russian peasantry. "The starving Russian peasantry formed the proletarian masses, with whom Russian capitalism practiced the art of 'primitive accumulation'. "50)

This rampant exploitation was the result of the immaturity of the labor movement. There were scattered signs of growth in the western provinces of Russia. Parvus saw this as a sign of the potential for the development of the Russian labor movement He spoke with particular expectation about the high level of awareness. The speeches made by workers at the May Day rally in 1892 were emblematic of this. He gives a detailed account of the speeches do.

That is, the speech began by highlighting the significance of May 1, the irreconcilability of class conflicts in society, and the necessity of the decline of capitalism. The speaker then went on to say that in order for the working class, suffering under capitalism, to liberate themselves, He emphasized the necessity of organization and called for learning from the historical example and lessons of the fraternal movements in Western Europe.

It also emphasized that the Jewish issue and women's issues should be reduced to class struggle, and that obtaining a constitution was the responsibility of the workers. It was preached that this was the first step in the class struggle, and to the pioneers who dedicated their lives to the struggle against the Tsarist regime. 51)

Following this speech that day about the growth of the working class, Parvus came to the following conclusion: A powerful revolutionary force is rising in Russia: the working class. Russia's cowardly bourgeoisie Gee will no doubt seek a compromise with the government... Class-conscious workers will not compromise. They cannot do anything. A democratic constitution is a matter of life and death for them. And the Russian workers are desperate to break away from absolutism. For the sake of himself and all mankind."52)

In short, Parvus believed that only the proletariat could achieve a democratic constitution and political freedom in Russia. In other words, what we have here is a proletarian-led Burj al-Assad. Its success or failure depends on the maturation of class consciousness among the proletariat. In other words, he was concerned with the Russian financial system, which had only just been established in the mid-1880s and was still in a state of over-exploitation. The uneven development of class consciousness among the Russian proletariat compared with the backwardness of socialism is a major factor in the proletariat's This recognition is a testament to the international continuity of the revolution. 53)

(2) Hopes for an international revolution

Of course, Parvus was not the only one to view the immediate task as a proletarian-led bourgeois revolution. This was a common idea among Plekhanov and Lenin. The Letariat alone cannot overthrow Tsarism. Plekhanov sought allies among the liberal bourgeoisie, and later Lenin among the peasants. Plekhanov's views, which were particularly dominant among Russian Marxists at the time, emphasized the "laws of history" and called on the proletariat to act with revolutionary restraint in order to bring the bourgeoisie to power. 54) Therefore, it was not an idea that confronted reality completely. It has been pointed out that.55)

But Parvus, by appealing to the Western proletariat, was able to overcome the realities of the situation. This breakthrough was due to the class struggle in Western Europe that was caused by the great famine in Russia. In other words, Russia, which had been the breadbasket of Europe, was hit hard by the severe famine of 1891-92. Russia was in danger of becoming a grain importing country. What will this bring to Europe, which has relied on imports? From this perspective, Parvus considers Russia's neighboring country, Germany. We look to the future of the labor movement.

As Parvus said: "Germany cannot survive without grain imports." The country was heavily dependent on imports of grain. Of course, the country was heavily dependent on Russia, and in 1985, the country imported only 100,000 grains, including wheat and rye. In fact, more than 50% of the total was covered by imports from Russia.56) The poor harvest caused a shortage of grain in Russia, It goes without saying that this was a major blow to. Itsuko. Parvus has taken note of this point. However, the grain shortage cannot be made up by importing from other countries. This will inevitably lead to a huge increase in the price of bread. This will lead to a fight between workers and capitalists over wage increases. This will surely increase the labor force because rising grain prices directly lead to rising living costs. Naturally, they will demand wage increases. On the other hand, from the perspective of capitalists, wage increases will not lead to an increase in commodity prices. In order to win the war, they had to reject it. This is all the more true in the current state of the world market, where a large reserve army of industrial capital is needed to capitalize on this struggle. This gives the house an advantage.57)

Therefore, "the working class faces a tough struggle. And everywhere workers' power lies only in organization. However, not only in trade union organizations, but also in combined political trade union organizations. If the working class unites, no matter what happens, there will be no force in society greater than the working class. There is no such thing."58

In other words, the organizational strength of workers is determined by the trade unions and the Labour Party ("political trade union organizations" refers to the Labour Party). According to Parvus's explanation, the former is the economic struggle against individual capitalists. The latter represents the interests of the working class as a whole, which cannot be fully expressed through individual economic struggles, in opposition to the capitalist class. 59) And it is precisely this organic combination of the two that allows the working class to take on the "hard struggle." What is particularly important here is the immense trust he had in organized labor. This has been described as an "almost romantic belief in revolutionary workers."60) This became an immovable coordinate system that would greatly determine his subsequent theoretical activities.

For example, Parvus later attributed the stagnation of the German revolutionary movement to the plutariat. They were unable to transform their inherent power into a revolutionary force and instead sought to return it to the party, which was immersed in its everyday activities.61) The defeat of "Bloody Sunday" was due to the fact that the party organization was insufficient to cope with the revolutionary energy displayed by the working masses. He summed up the situation as a result of what had happened and said, "Organize the revolution."62) And this sanctification of organized labor In his vision of revolution, "belief" plays the role of a mediator between international connections. It is only on the premise of this consciousness that the rise of the working class in Russia, a late capitalist country, and the great famine in Russia can be seen as a turning point. The intensification of class struggle in Germany that followed can be understood from the same perspective of international revolution. He thought about the international continuity of revolution as follows.

"The working class of Russia stands as another link in the great and powerful chain of the united proletariat of the whole world. Only the power of the earth can break this chain. At the same time that Russian capitalism reached its peak, the power of international capital and the power of Russian capitalism were at an all-time high. It has probably already been undermined."63

Although Plehanov certainly expected the revolution to have an international connection, he did not see it as a necessity and considered it a fundamental In 1945, he proposed the theory of a "discontinuous two-stage revolution" based on the Russian state.64) However, in Parvus's concept, This connection was essential. His idea of a proletarian-led revolution was recognized in the chain of international revolutions.

There lies a firm belief in the class consciousness of the proletariat in Russia and Western Europe. was.

(3) Amid the Intersection of Revolutionary Factions

As mentioned above, in a series of papers on Russia in the early 1990s, Parvus wrote about the devastation caused by the Great Famine in Russian society. He revealed to his German comrades the prospects for revolution and the resulting unrest. The revolutionary vision he presented was not unrelated to his German comrades in that it aimed for an international revolution. However, it is said that the German socialists themselves did not pay much attention to the situation in Russia. At that time, they still considered the Russian revolutionary movement to be the most backward in Europe, Russia was therefore only peripheral to the German political struggle.65

On the other hand, the reality of the Russian revolutionary movement at the time was far from realizing Parvus' vision. The Russian revolutionaries in exile, who could be said to be the core of its leadership, were the descendants of the People's Will Party, which had already collapsed. The Lavrov faction, which followed this, and the emerging "Liberation of Labor" group, which was led by Plekhanov and took a Marxist stance. The "People's Will" faction criticized the "Labor Liberation League" as "separatists." The "Liberation of Labor" group, however, was founded with the conversion of Tikhomirov, the former leader of the "People's Will" party (August 1888). The SPD responded to this dispute in a delicate manner.

Engels, already in his later years, was concerned about the conflict between these two factions and began to prepare for the coming Russian Revolution. He also longed for a united front of Russian revolutionaries. The famine of 1891-92 made him realize that revolution was imminent. This wish was all the more fervent, as it foresaw the possibility of a settlement. As can be seen, the SPD leaders shared the same aspirations as Engels.66) This was in response to both of their factions. For example, in the theoretical journal Neue Zeit, edited by Kautsky, While articles by the Plekhanov school were published, the central organ, Vorbe, edited by W. Liebknecht, One notable example is that the "Ezi" was open to contributions from the Lavrov faction.67)

The background to the SPD's attitude is that it is a movement aimed at the dissolution of the Russian Empire, and that this is unacceptable regardless of party affiliation. Western socialists, like Marx, were aware that Tsarism should be supported under certain conditions. He considered it a "plasterwork of reaction across Europe." I agree with this view. And when he was studying in Switzerland, he also founded the He participated in the Socialist Literature Fond (1887-1888) and advocated that the antagonism between the two factions would be an obstacle to the revolutionary movement in Russia. 68) However, in the 1990s, he changed his position based on his analysis of the situation in Russia and became a neutral member of the SPD. From his perspective, the SPD has been in a sharp decline since Tikhomirov took over as leader of the "People's Will." The expectations placed on the faction seemed to be pointless and based on a lack of understanding of reality.

Parvus criticized the People's Will faction by pointing to the growth of the labor movement in Russia. He urged the SPD executives to change their attitude. This is because, up until now, reports about Russia have focused on the atrocities of the tsarist regime, the miserable conditions of the people, It was a given that this was a brave act of indignation by the people. It is said that this is an example that serves as an instructive example for the whole world. However, the "will of the people" The traditional view of the Russians cannot grasp this reality. The American labor movement is impossible, and therefore it is impossible to fight for political rights for the people... 69)

Parvus then commented on the claims of the "People's Will" faction, saying, "While claiming to be for the people, In history, where the people make everything, it is as if something was made without the people. 70) This is because Plekhanov described the revolutionary theory of the "People's Will" faction as "People's Will." 71) For Parvus, the workers he trusts completely are Since the class is growing in Russia, I cannot accept the view that its role will be taken over by the intelligentsia. He believed that from now on the "Liberation of Labor" group and the working class would become the mainstream of the Russian revolutionary movement. He emphasizes this point.

"What they [the "Liberation of Labor" group] foresaw is happening. The intelligentsia is trying to achieve freedom in Russia. It was not won. Now the workers are rising. Despite all the repression, the workers are rising. They are coming together."72

As revolutionary factions in Russia and Germany intersected, Parvus clarified his position as mentioned above and joined the SPD. In particular, the Forerunners, which neglected the existence and activities of the "Labor Liberation" group and provided space for the "People's Will" faction, The editorial staff of the magazine Welt were impressed that the "Liberation of Labor" group was becoming the central force in the Russian revolutionary movement. With his strong recommendation, the SPD leaders recognized the "Liberation of Labor" as the representative of Russia. The Vorwärts also stopped publishing contributions by Lavrov and others, and in December 1992 In 1915, Plekhanov's open letter to W. Liebknecht appeared in the press. In that it opened the eyes of the SPD to the reality of Russia: the rise of the Soviet Party and the decline of Narodnikism. It was "the first contribution to the relations between Russian and German socialists." 73)

In lieu of a conclusion

The above is a summary of Parvus's famine, focusing on "The State of Papua" published in June 1892 and the supplementary papers. I have attempted to reconstruct the theory of famine. To summarize it once again, Parvus identifies agriculture as the root cause of the Great Famine in Russia. The ultimate solution is therefore the transition to capitalist methods of production in agriculture. This transition further accelerated the disintegration of the peasantry, which had been precipitated by the Great Famine, and led to the mass exodus of proletarians. He predicts that the rapid development of Russian capitalism will be stopped. The abundant labor force that would be created was the very evidence for this.

In this way, Parvus understands the development of Russian capitalism as a spontaneous development within a single country. However, he was thinking about the reality of the revolution from an international perspective. Behind this was the desire to Distrust of the Russian and Western proletariat and expectations for them were two sides of the same coin.

His theory of revolution was that the small but class-conscious Russian proletariat would carry out the bourgeois revolution and
The plan was for the European proletariat to support this
His strong support for the Liberation of Labor" movement among the SPD leaders also contributed to this vision.
It can be understood from the perspective of

In other words, Parvus's arguments as a young man already contained a rough outline of the basic idea of "workers' democracy."
In any case, the idea was already in the making. It was in the form of Marx's "Appeal to the Members of the Central Committee of March 1850"
It can be called the Russian version of the idea of a continuous revolution led by the proletariat, which he proposed for Germany in 1945.
The reality of the Russian Revolution he suggested was further reinforced in the late 1990s by his immersion in research on the global market.
This is therefore reinforced by an understanding of the state of world capitalism, particularly its crisis cycle 75).

However, on the other hand, Parvus's arguments at this time also show a number of theoretical immaturities.
As already mentioned, there is a misconception about the disintegration of the peasant class, but his unlimited support for the working class is also
This idealization, however, is not immune to criticism.
Wasn't what he captured actually an outpouring of more primitive resistance from the oppressed people?
From the point of view of the revolution, he mentions the international continuity of the revolution, but he does not consider the position of this gradual continuity.
remains unclear, and it is not until 1905 that it is clarified.

There are many other points of criticism, but it should not be forgotten that Parvus was already in his mid-twenties.
He always considered the acquisition of power by the Letariat to be a realistic goal.
For him, revolution is not something to sit and wait for, but something to fight for
It was something.

Note

1) L••P•1d H•H•im••n, Th••Russian Marxists and the O•igins•f B•1•he•i•m (H••va d UP, 1955),
pp. 49-51.

2) Martov, History of the Russian Social Democratic Party, translated by Kato Ichiro (Shinsensha, 1976), p. 16.

3) For the life of Parvus, see The Merchant of the Revolution (Fumaisha, 1971), translated by Scharlau, Zeman, Kurata, and Kadokura.
Although he began to use the pen name Parvus only after 1894, this article will refer to him as Parvus.

4) Winfried B. Scharlau, Parvus-Helphand als Theoretiker in der deutschen Sozialdemohratie und seine
Rolle in der ersten russischen Revolution (1867-1911), Phil. Diss., Münster (1960), S. 37.

5) My article "Parvus, Trotsky, and Lenin in the First Russian Revolution," Meiji University Graduate School Bulletin, Vol. 24, No. 1-3
(1986).

6) Richard G. Robbins Jr., Famine In Rtcssia 1891/1892 (Columbia UP, 1975), p. 2,185.

7) Ibid., pp. 1-6.

8) For more details, see Chapter 7 of Tanaka Masaharu, Research on the History of Russian Economic Thought (Minerva Shobo, 1967).

9) Parvus, Im Kampf um die Wahrheit (Berlin, 1918), S. 8.

10) Konrad Haenisch, Parvus: Ein Blatt der Erinnerung (Berlin, 1925), S. 8.

11) [Parvus], "Die Lage" in RuBland I. Die ntichste Ernte", Vorwdirts, den 17. Juni 1892.

12) Hinamida Shizuma, Studies on the History of Russian Agricultural Policy (Ochanomizu Shobo, 1966), p. 208.

13) [Parvus], a. a. 0.

14) [Parvus], "Die Lage in Rußland II. Der Zusammenbruch des bäuerlichen Rußlands", *Vorwärts*, den 18. Juni 1892.

15) 菊地昌典『ロシア農奴解放の研究』（御茶の水書房、1964年）419頁。

16) Robbins, *op. cit.*, p. 6, 9.

17) [Parvus], a. a. O.

18) Robbins, *op. cit.*, p. 8.

19) C. Lehmann und Parvus, *Das hungernde Rußland*, Stuttgart, 1900), S. 535.

20) [Parvus], a. a. O.

21) ラウエ、菅原崇光訳『セルゲイ・ウィッテとロシアの工業化』（勁草書房、1977年）25頁、日南田、前掲書、204、208頁。

22) 菊地、前掲書、421頁。

23) [Parvus], a. a. O.

24) 小島定氏によれば、プレハーノフは『われわれの意見の相違』（1885年）において、ロシア農村共同体の解体の必然性を「外的解体論」と「内的解体論」（土地の共同所有と経営の私的所有との内在的矛盾の把握）という二重の論理をもって説明した。しかし大飢饉に際して書かれた「全ロシア的破産」（1892年）では、飢饉の原因究明を通じて解体の契機を「租税の重圧」に求める「外的解体論」が前面に登場し、「内的解体論」は後景に追いやられている。小島定「プレハーノフの飢饉論(一)」『商学論集』（福島大学）55巻1号（1986年）134頁、同「プレハーノフの飢饉論(二)」55巻2号、81頁。なおパルヴスはこのプレハーノフの「全ロシア的破産」を絶賛している。[Parvus], "Die Hungersnot in Rußland", *Neue Zeit*, 1891/92, Bd. 2, S. 486.

25) ワリツキ、日南田他訳『ロシア資本主義論争』（ミネルヴァ書房、1975年）154頁。

26) [Parvus], "Die Lage in Rußland II. Der Zusammenbruch des bäuerlichen Rußlands".

27) [Parvus], "Die Hungersnot in Rußland", S. 494.

28) [Parvus], "Die Lage in Rußland II. Der Zusammenbruch des bäuerlichen Rußlands".

29) Ebenda.

30) 和田春樹「近代ロシアの発展構造(一)」『社会科学研究』17巻2号（1965年）160頁。

31) [Parvus], a. a. O.

32) Ebenda.

33) 高橋馨「初期プレハーノフの諸問題」『現代思想』（青土社）1976年11月号、230頁。

34) 詳しくは、渡辺寛『レーニンの農業理論』（御茶の水書房、1963年）95-136頁。

35) 前掲書、99頁。中山弘正『帝政ロシアと外国資本』（岩波書店、1988年）33、53頁。

36) この点については、田中良明「パルヴスとカウツキーの農民論」『法経論集 経済・経営篇I』（愛知大学）111号（1986年）。

37) 彼は『プロレタリアートの階級闘争』（1911年）において、それまでの低い農民評価を改め、農民大衆とプロレタリアートの利害のつながりが、社会主義を準備すると述べるに至る。拙稿「パルヴスの社会主義像」『明治大学大学院紀要』第25集-3（1987年）129頁。

38) 中山、前掲書、80-81頁。

39) 菊地、前掲書、426頁。

40) [Parvus], "Die Lage in Rußland III. Das Zarentum", *Vorwärts*, den 19. Juni 1892.

41) 中山、前掲書、79-80頁。

42) [Parvus], a. a. O.

43) [Parvus], "Die Situation in Rußland", *Neue Zeit*, 1891/92, Bd. 2, S. 272.

44) [Parvus], "Der Schmerzenschrei eines russischen Reaktionär", *Neue Zeit*, 1891/92, Bd. 1, S. 568.

45) [Parvus], "Die Lage in Rußland III. Das Zarentum".

46) Teruo Sasaki, "Freedom and Hunger in Imperial Russia," Russian History Studies No. 36 (1982), pp. 26-27, 35.

47) Haimson, op. cit., p. 50. Regarding the People's Rights Party, see Inakake Hisao, "On the People's Rights Party," Slavic Research, No. 32 (1985).

48) [Parvus], a. a. O.

49) [Parvus], "Die Situation in Rußland", S. 270-271.

50) [Parvus], "Aus einem Lande der ursprünglicher Akkumulation (Sibirien)", *Neue Zeit*, 1893/94, Book 1, S. 247-249.

51) [Parvus], "Die Sozialdemokratie in Rußland", *Vorwärts*, den 23. September 1892.

52) Ebenda.

53) Plekhanov also emphasized the importance of recognizing the uneven development of the basic process and proletarian class consciousness in underdeveloped countries, and this recognition is said to have provided the foundation for his theory of permanent revolution. Tanaka Masaharu, op. cit., pp. 64-65.

54) Ibid., pp. 62-64.

55) Wada, op. cit., pp. 151-152.

56) Nakayama, op. cit., p. 32.

57) [Parvus], "Die Lage in Rußland IV. Folgen für Europa", *Vorwärts*, den 21. Juni 1892.

58) Ebenda.

59) Ebenda.

60) Scharlau, a. a. O., S. 166.

61) Парвус, "Война и революция IV. Самодержавие и реформы", *Искра*, №82, 1-го января 1905г.

62) Парвус, "Итоги и перспективы", *Искра*, №85, 27-го января 1905г.

63) [Parvus], "Die Lage in Rußland II. Zusammenbruch des bäuerlichen Rußlands".

64) Tanaka Masaharu, op. cit., pp. 56-57.

65) Peter Lösche, *Der Bolschewismus im Urteil der deutschen Sozialdemokratie 1903-1920* (Berlin, 1967), pp. 20-21.

66) Haruki Wada, Marx, Engels and Revolutionary Russia (Keiso Shobo, 1975), pp. 305-306.

67) Ibid., pp. 289-290.

68) Teruo Sasaki, "A Brief History of the Socialist Literature Fond," Slavic Studies No. 34 (1987), p. 6.

69) [Parvus], "Die Sozialdemokratie in Rußland".

70) Ebenda.

71) Kojima Sada, op. cit., "Plekhanov's Theory of Famine (1)", p. 115.

72) [Parvus], a. a. O.

73) Scharlau and Zeeman, op. cit., p. 35.

74) For more on this, see Awaji Kenji, Marx's Image of Revolution in Underdeveloped Countries (Miraisha, 1971), pp. 53-61.

75) Winfried B. Scharlau, "Parvus und Trockij: 1904-1914 Ein Beitrag zur Theorie der permanenten Revolution", *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas*, vol. 10 (1962), S. 351-352.